



Jet Propulsion Laboratory
California Institute of Technology

ADDENDUM II

To

Mars Critical Data Products Initiative IV (CDP IV)

Request For Proposal

CDP-RFP-RF180507

18 May 2007

ADDENDUM II

CDP-RFP-RF180507

Note: The cut off date for submission of questions with respect to this RFP is 19 June 2007.

THE BELOW QUESTIONS (**Q**) WERE POSED BY POTENTIAL RESPONDENTS TO THIS RFP.
ANSWERS (**A**) ARE CITED IN BLUE TEXT.

Q: Do you have any idea how many proposals will be funded?

A: We expect to fund several proposals in the range of about \$25,000 to about \$100,000 per year.

Q: From the landing site voting results, there are over 10 "yes" and many "no", does a proposal only need to work the site with "yes"? Does a proposal only need to do one; several selected ones, or all of the ones with "yes"?

Q: There are many tasks listed in the task form. Does a proposal only need to focus on one task, several selected tasks, or all of the tasks for the sites, whatever needed to do (answer to my second question)?

A: You can submit multiple proposals, or one proposal, for the task(s) you wish to address. However, only one proposal per task is permitted per the RFP.

Q: Regarding: Foreign/Non US Organization and Institution:

How will an Indian/Foreign Institution Project proposal be processed? As an employee of Indian Institute of Remote Sensing – Dehradun, Government of India, Department of space, the project needs to be cleared by our Director National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA) and Chairman Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO). (In our case the project money of science teams is generally routed through our parent organization). Generally there is a memorandum of understanding (MoU) between institutes for such joint works (e.g. recent MoU of NASA and ISRO on miniSAR and M3 instruments onboard Chandrayaan-1).

A: The instrument JPL uses to fund successfully selected proposals is a subcontract. JPL doesn't need an MOU. Matters of project clearance on your end are an internal function for your organization.

Q: Regarding: Mars critical data products to upcoming Mars Phoenix Mission:

Is this proposal (CDP –RFP – RF180507) limited only to the Mars Science Laboratory (MSL), or can we send similar theme/task based proposal for landing site of the Phoenix Lander Mission (2007-2008)? If yes, then what are possible sciences themes and possible time frame of delivering the CDP to Phoenix mission?

A: Only those proposals addressing the desired tasks and data products will be considered.

Q: Regarding: Data Requirements and associated costs for CDP Science tasks:

CDP theme: Digital Elevation Models: What datasets will be provided to Science teams to generate DEM of 1m to 10m resolution? Presently MGS-MOLA and Mars Express HRSC are only two sources of Mars terrain elevation, but do they have 1m-20m vertical resolution? Still, if we use the high resolution stereo images (e.g., HRSC or MRO different dates image of same area for stereo photogrammetry) of MSL/Phoenix landing sites, will the cost of images will be covered by Project money, or will they be provided free of charges for final CDP product delivery?

CDP theme: Mineralogical Mapping for MSL: In similar lines as for High resolution DEM, will the cost of MRO/CRISM or Mars Express/OMEGA datasets for MSL/Phoenix landing sites be covered with project money? Else the landing site specific images will be given free of cost for final CDP product delivery?

A: Proposers must use data available to them through normal channels. For most proposers, this is released data. However, instrument teams that have proprietary access to their instrument data may use that data as well.

Q: Does the data used in this proposal need to be publicly available data, or can unreleased data from CRISM, THEMIS and HiRISE be used?

A: Proposers must use data available to them through normal channels. For most proposers, this is released data. However, instrument teams that have proprietary access to their instrument data may use that data as well.

Q: It seems to me that an essential task for MSL landing sites is missing from this RFP. It calls for high-res DEMs to evaluate small-scale slopes, but this is very expensive and won't cover much area. Photoclinometry can be used to produce slope maps without creating DEMs (e.g. Beyer et al., 2003, attached). Much greater areas can be evaluated, from single images, than will ever be possible via DEMs. The DEMs that are produced can be used to calibrate the photoclinometry-based slope maps. I'm not planning to propose this task, but someone else should do so. I guess someone could punt and say they will produce DEMs from photoclinometry, but since slope is really the desired metric that's a little silly.

A: In addition to DEMs, slope maps with ~1 to 10 m spatial horizontal resolution will be considered.

Q: The product delivery dates (October '07; August '08; June '09) coincide with the MSL landing site selection workshop schedule. At each of these workshops, a down select of the candidate sites is on tap. Is the intent to have CDP products presented and/or made available for the first time at the workshops? Given that the CDP products could contribute significantly to the down selection process, will there be lead time between the product delivery dates and the workshops?

A: The expectation is that selections will be made in August and subcontracts will be in place in September. The first delivery of products, in October 2007, will be satisfied by presentations at the Second MSL Landing Site Workshop (October 23-25, 2007) along with whatever data products are required in a subcontract. Data product deliveries for future MSL Landing Site Workshops may be negotiated before the MSL Landing Site Workshops in August 2008 and June 2009 if it is beneficial to the MSL Project.

Q: What is the current funding start date estimate for this initiative? In the proposal, I'd like to appropriately scale the effort required to generate the products for the first delivery to the time available.

A: The expectation is that selections will be made in August 2007 and subcontracts will be in place sometime in September 2007.

Q: In laying out the data processing and analysis requirements for the primary task the proposal would take on, it has become clear that with minimal additional effort one of the items from a different task could also be addressed. Is potential task interaction along this line good, bad, or indifferent?

A: You can submit multiple proposals, or only one proposal. However, only one proposal per task is permitted per the RFP. If the same effort will cover more than one task, then submit a separate proposal for each task.

Submitting multiple proposals or a single proposal will not improve or diminish the chances of being selected, as each winning proposal will be accepted on its merit.

Q: First, in Appendix B, section B.2, items 1 through 4 (cover page through budget) are identified as "the actual sections of the proposal package to be submitted." Is it safe to assume, then, that item 5 ("Science/Technical Section) was unintentional? If not, what would be the difference between item 2 (Proposal) and item 5?

Second, is Attachment A-19 ("cost elements breakdown") the same thing as item 4 (budget)?

A: Item 5 is part of the informational part of Appendix B and is given to provide guidance on what is to go into the proposal and schedule. Items 1-4 are the sections that must be in any proposal submitted.

Providing a completed A-19 will meet the budget requirement. You can use the provided A-19 or an alternate computer generated form so long as we get the budget detail. Please see item 7 in Appendix B.